

THE JEWISH THEME IN THE RELATIONSHIP OF SIGMUND FREUD AND SÁNDOR FERENCZI: BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE.

András Sziklai

I would like to thank the Aron Menczer Fund and the European Forum at the Hebrew University for their generous support for this article. I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Silber for his guidance during the writing of the article and for his invaluable insights on the history and the present of Central European Jewry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The theories of Carl E. Schorske and Péter Hanák Theories about Freud's Jewish identity Discussion
Psychoanalysis between the state and the private sector Jews and gentiles in the psychoanalytic movement

The disintegration of the Monarchy Conclusion

Bibliography

MOTTO

West End Avenue. An upper-middle-class Jewish couple. The father, liberal, intense, a vociferously militant atheist. Wanting a superior education for their son, the parents enroll him at Trinity School, which, whatever its denominational origins, is now secular, open to all. One day, after about a month, the boy comes home and says, casually, "By the way, Dad, do you know what Trinity means? It means the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost". Whereupon, barely controlling himself, the father seizes the boy by the shoulders and declares, "Danny, I'm going to tell you something now and I want you never to forget it. There is only one God – and we do not believe in him!"¹

INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the correspondence between two of the most influential intellectuals of the psychoanalytic movement in its formative decades: Sigmund Freud (1856-1938) and Sándor Ferenczi (1873-1933).² The latter, less known to the wider public, was the founder of the psychoanalytic movement in Hungary, its central figure until his early death, and if not the initiator then at least a fertile source of ideas which constituted the basis for advanced tendencies in psychoanalysis –for example, the psychology of the self or the interpersonal treatment, which have their obvious origin in the practice or in the thoughts of Ferenczi. For a long time Ferenczi did not receive even posthumous recognition for these ideas; I will discuss the reasons for this long silence later.³

1.- Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 55.

2.- An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Conference of the Centers of Austrian Studies in September 2008 in Edmonton, Canada.

3.- Ferenc Erős, "Miért Ferenczi?", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében, Egy Ferenczi Monográfia Vázlata*, ["Why Ferenczi?", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: József Eötvös Könyvek, 2004), 39-42; Pál Harmat, *Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis, A Budapesti Mélylélektani Iskola Története* [Freud, Ferenczi and Psychoanalysis in Hungary: The History of the Psychoanalytic School of Budapest] (Budapest: Bethlen Gábor Könyvkiadó, 1994), 128-146.

According to Immanuel Bergman, despite the seventeen-year difference in age, the dialogue between these two emblematic thinkers was conducted as equal colleagues, and established the contours of the present discourse of psychoanalysis.⁴ This personal correspondence, which was first published in the 1990s, deals not only with matters of psychoanalysis but also reflects the cultural, social and political developments of the disintegrating Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. I will focus on one aspect of this intellectual dialogue, namely, the influence of Freud and Ferenczi's Jewish identity on their social and intellectual disposition.

This paper deals with the nexus between intellectual and sociological history; therefore its emphasis is mainly on the cultural and sociological facets of the psychoanalytic movement and of psychoanalytic theory itself. If the choice of this theme for a historical investigation of this sort needs explanation, it lies in the historiography of Carl E. Schorske and Péter Hanák, whose ideas compose the theoretical foundation of the paper. Although their theories have had numerous critics since their appearance in the late 1970s, I found the socio-cultural interpretation of the Garden –Vienna– of Schorske and the Workshop –Budapest– of Hanák a very useful theoretical background for my inquiry on the Freud-Ferenczi relationship.

Indeed, I believe that the true value of my paper is the integration of the existing theories on the Jewish theme of the socio-cultural environment of the psychoanalytic movement on the one hand, and the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence on the other, specifically in a historical framework. I will try to demonstrate that the mutual relationship between the state and the public sphere was the key factor in shaping the Jewish question in fin-de-siècle Central Europe.

THE THEORIES OF CARL E. SCHORSKE AND PÉTER HANÁK

I will begin by sketching the theoretical framework of this investigation: the central ideas of Carl E. Schorske and Péter Hanák and their respective critics. In addition, this chapter will give a brief overview of the socio-cultural landscape of fin-de-siècle

Budapest and Vienna. Schorske's fundamental work, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture*, is his attempt to analyze, as a historian, what he saw as the ahistorical Viennese culture of the turn of the century. The sharp discontinuity of Viennese modernist culture vis-à-vis its historical precedents fostered, according to Schorske, a flourishing ahistorical culture, liberated from the limits imposed by historical tradition. This ahistorical environment required a multi-disciplinary research of the different facets of modernist culture. Vienna proved to be appropriate for this sort of research, Schorske argues, because of its coherent context in contrast to London, Berlin or Paris at the time. In Schorske's understanding of Viennese culture, psychoanalysis has a central position, not only as a common language for the diverse intellectual and artistic branches but also in explaining the revolt of the modernists against the moral premises of their paternal bourgeois society as an oedipal revolt.⁵

Schorske, in his essay "Politics and Patricide in Freud's Interpretation of Dreams", characterizes Freud's revolutionary book *The Interpretation of Dreams*⁶ as a combination of a scientific investigation and a personal confession, a scientific theory along with an "incomplete but autonomous subplot of personal history".⁷ Schorske asserts that Freud attempts to create an "epoch making interpretation of human experience in which politics could be reduced to an epiphenomenal manifestation of psychic forces".⁸ Schorske claims that Freud's intellectual activity can be seen as a discharge of the tension between the developments of the post-liberal Viennese political system and Freud's social position, which was determined by his Jewish identity. In Schorske's view, the birth of psychoanalysis was inconceivable without Freud's psychological attitude towards his father or without his disillusionment with the political environment after the breakdown of the liberal political arrangement of the Monarchy towards the end of the nineteenth century. Schorske viewed psychoanalysis as a result of the interaction of different layers of Freud's own life experience: the personal, the professional and the political. Freud, as a member of the Viennese *Bildungsbürgertum* (educated middle class), very much resented the atmosphere in the political and in the public sphere. At the

4.- Immanuel Berman, "haKol ha'Aher: Sándor Ferenczi uTrumato laTipul", in Sándor Ferenczi, *Bilbul haSafot ben haMevuggarim laYeled* [Immanuel, Berman, "The Other Voice: The Contribution of Sándor Ferenczi to Treatment"], in Sándor Ferenczi, *Confusion of Tongues between Adults and Child, Essays 1908-1933*, (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2005), 12-13

5.- Carl E. Schorske, "Introduction", in *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, 1981), xvii-xxx.

6.- The book was intended to be a revolutionary and modern achievement also by Freud himself. Although the first edition was published in 1899, Freud asked to have 1900 printed as the year of publication.

7.- Carl E. Schorske, "Politics and Patricide in Freud's Interpretation of Dreams", in *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, 1981), 183.

8.- *Ibid.*, 183.

end of the nineteenth century, the Christian Socialist Karl Lueger was elected mayor of Vienna, the news of the Dreyfus affair filled the Viennese newspapers and the political mood strongly influenced the public sphere. Undoubtedly the professional advancement of Freud and of other Jewish scientists was impeded by this atmosphere.

On a practical level, Freud retreated into a certain social isolation; his joining of B'nai B'rith in 1897 indicated this social attitude. On a theoretical level, however, he aimed at creating an intellectual system which would enable him to reduce the political and public reality to "an epiphenomenal status in relation to the primal conflict between father and son"⁹. Schorske draws on Freud's dream stories with personal content in order to depict his ambivalent stance towards the Catholic socio-political system of the Habsburg state. His disappointment at the fact that he could not have a political career in the hostile Christian society, symbolized by imperial and later Catholic Rome on the level of the manifest dream, colors numerous accounts of dreams, the most significant of all these being the Revolutionary Dream. In this dream Freud achieved his victory over the inauspicious political system through patricide, overcoming his aging father who symbolized the prime minister of Austria.¹⁰ Schorske maintains that Freud overcame the unreceptive post-liberal political system through an ahistorical theory of human and social behavior.

Another instance which reflects Freud's determination to challenge the Viennese political and social order, Schorske argues, is his citation on the title page of *The Interpretation of Dreams* from Virgil's *Aeneid*: "Flectere si nequeo superos, Achroma movebo" (If I cannot bend the higher powers, I shall stir up hell). Freud's message, Schorske believes, was that the unconscious and its sexual forces would overcome the bourgeois political and social system, and the science of psychoanalysis alone would be able to control it¹¹. The question arises whether some of these subversive intentions were connected strictly to the Jewish theme in Freud's social orientation. In addition, one may ask to what extent the theoretical basis of psychoanalysis was necessarily conceived, and functioned at least in its first years, in a Jewish socio-cultural environment in the face of the morals of the Christian bourgeois society.

Schorske's paradigm of Viennese modernist culture in his book *Vienna 1900*, a paradigm built on a special relationship between aesthetics and politics, was criticized by many. Mary Gluck does not doubt the centrality of the psyche to fin-de-siècle culture but criticizes two main beliefs of the paradigm. Regarding the political sphere, she questions the accepted course of the political system in Vienna: a short period of Austrian liberalism followed by the collapse of the liberal establishment in the face of irrational mass politics. Instead of accepting the narrative of the short-lived liberal legacy, she points to the dominant elements of the "dynastic tradition" of the Habsburg state. The latter political tradition was not necessarily opposed to chauvinistic nationalism; it could even have been, in Gluck's view, a "prelude" to anti-liberal policies. Furthermore, she doubts the ahistorical and apolitical nature of Viennese modernism, and asserts that "aesthetic self-fashioning" can be seen as an active political statement and not necessarily as a passive, individualistic act replacing public activity¹².

Similarly, William J. McGrath does not doubt the importance of the psychological sensitiveness dominating the culture of fin-de-siècle Vienna. However, he does view differently the crisis of the liberal political system as well as the relationship between Viennese modernist culture and Viennese politics, two issues closely interrelated in his outlook. McGrath considers, primarily in the social sense, the so-called 'anti-liberal mass politics' as a continuation of the Josephinian traditional liberal politics, as a counterculture to the individualist liberal system. Furthermore, he emphasizes the continuity between Austrian modernist culture and its irrational philosophical and artistic sources. As for Freud, McGrath highlights, if not the influence, then at least the common emotional terms of the psyche between Freudian theories and the philosophical ideals of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. Via the individual fate of the members of the Pernerstorfer circle, McGrath offers a different understanding of the relationship between aesthetics and politics in Viennese modernism from that of Schorske, representing, among other things, the music of Gustav Mahler and the politics of Victor Adler as public expressions of Wagnerian collectivist emotionalism critical of the impersonal liberal society.¹³

Walter Laqueur likewise criticizes the omission of important intellectuals and artists from the range of subjects in Schorske's work. He, too, blames Schorske for his selective choice of the key personages in strengthening his theory's premises. Laqueur also sees the phenomenon of "Vienna 1900" in the context of

9.- Ibid., 197..

10.- Ibid., 197.

11.- Ibid., 181-207.

12.- Mary Gluck, "Rethinking Culture in Central Europe", *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997): 217-222.

13.- William J. McGrath, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

the broader European phenomenon of decadence, whose other centers such as Paris, Berlin or Moscow were at any rate not secondary to Vienna.¹⁴

Schorske is often criticized for presenting Vienna as the birthplace of modernism and disregarding the importance, let alone precedence, of other urban centers of culture in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In this context, Roger Shattuck's theory of avant-garde culture is useful. Shattuck prefers to designate the artistic figures and tendencies, such as Huysmans, Eliot, Mayakovsky, Dada, Picasso, Futurism and Proust, as decadentism instead of the confusing term modernism. Indeed, in Shattuck's view, for this trend art still had acute political importance and progressive intentions, even a quasi-messianic goal of transforming society according to its own values; and psychology was not a key factor in culture. In this cultural context, Vienna – much less important than Paris, Spain or Russia – was far from being a vital center of these artistic tendencies.¹⁵

On the basis of Shattuck's theory, Steven Beller makes an important differentiation between the artistic tendencies of modernism mentioned by Shattuck, and Schorske's intellectual and artistic trends depicted in his *fin-de-siècle* Vienna. Beller adopts the term post-modernism for the intellectual and artistic environment of Vienna, which revolved around the psyche and turned its back on the progressive socio-artistic credo of positivism. In Beller's view, Vienna could certainly have been the birthplace of postmodernism but not of the decadence trend¹⁶.

William M. Johnson's criticism is twofold. On the one hand, he claims that Schorske's evident omissions of a long list of artists and intellectuals in his essays are intended to strengthen his theory, i.e. the retreat of the modernist artists and intellectuals from the public realm of Vienna at the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, Johnson does acknowledge the escapist tendency among the Viennese upper and middle bourgeoisie even before the last third of that century. Johnson argues that Schorske's article omits the escapism in the face of the pre-1848 and post-1848 neo-absolutist political and public atmosphere. The Viennese bourgeoisie first began to cultivate its gardens back then because of the reactionary censorship of the neo-absolutist period. Therefore, in Johnson's view, *fin-de-siècle* Vienna lacks its necessary historical background in Schorske's work¹⁷.

The essay-project of Schorske as well as that of Hanák were extensively criticized because of their alleged non-uniformity, bringing together articles written over a long period and sometimes dealing with overly varied themes. Scott Spector maintains that the choice of the genre of the essay was ideal for expressing the encounter between the historical context and the aesthetic realm. He relies on György Lukács's *Soul and Forms* to elucidate the essentiality of the essay in aestheticist criticism.

Lukács asserts the essay's fragmentary nature at the same time as he stresses its unique power to fuse the realms of the aesthetic and of life; related to this is the seemingly insoluble tension between the aesthetic moment of the work of art and its historical context. Finally, Lukács is explicit concerning the autobiographical quality of this form of criticism, as the "aestheticist criticism" he describes in the essays increasingly approaches a narration of self¹⁸.

Spector adds that Schorske's project very much reflects the process which the academic disciplinary culture itself underwent: "the transition from high liberal historicism to fragmentary modernism"¹⁹.

According to the key theory of Hanák's collection *The Garden and the Workshop*, inspired by Schorske's inquiry on *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, while we can witness a basically escapist Viennese modernism (coined "the Garden" by Schorske), the intellectual and political tendency of the so-called 'second Hungarian reformist generation' in Budapest

–"the Workshop"– was essentially socially obligated. Hanák's essay collection is inspired by Schorske's *Fin-de-siècle* Vienna not only in its understanding of the Viennese cultural environment, but also in adopting Schorske's interdisciplinary approach in his selection of the articles comparing different socio-cultural facets of the two cities. The broad spectrum of themes of the collection's essays includes urban architecture, images of minorities, burial customs, literature and music.

Hanák's central essay, "The Garden and the Workshop", compares two allegedly different public

14.- Walter Laqueur, review of *Fin-de-siècle* Vienna by Carl E. Schorske, *Society* (November/December (1980): 89.

15.- Steven Beller, "Owls Fly by Night: Recent Literature on Fin de Siècle Vienna", *Historical Journal* 31, no. 3 (September 1988): 666.

16.- *Ibid*, 666-667.

17.- William M. Johnson, "Cultivated Gardeners", *The American Scholar* (2001): 260-266.

18.- Scott Spector, "Beyond the Aesthetic Garden: Politics and Culture on the Margins of 'Fin-de-siècle Vienna'", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 4 (October 1998): 692.

19.- Spector, "Beyond the Aesthetic Garden", 693.

approaches of the artistic and intellectual stratum in the two capitals of the Monarchy. As for Vienna, Hanák reflects about the reason for the retreat of Austrian bourgeoisie into its Viennese Gardens. He asserts that while the Viennese middle class was economically and culturally not at all less significant than its counterpart in Budapest, it was bound through a political alliance to “traditional, dynastic state patriotism” and not to modern nationalism as in the case of West European societies at the end of the nineteenth century. This bourgeois class was composed essentially of assimilated Slavic, Jewish and to a lesser extent Hungarian and Italian immigrants. These immigrants did not internalize German nationalism; instead they recognized the Habsburg political system in return for economic and political premises which secured their social and political existence. They preferred a stance of cosmopolitan liberalism to Western-style parliamentarianism. They favored the liberty of the autonomous individual versus the collective rights of the nation. Towards the fin-de-siècle the Viennese bourgeoisie found itself, on the one hand, threatened by post-liberal political mass movements of the socialists and the Christian Democrats; on the other, alienated from the technocratic state bureaucracy²⁰. Hence it retreated to its Gardens, enjoying the illusion of individualism in the harmony – or disharmony – of its avant-garde art. Hanák believes that the Gardens of the Viennese Secession symbolized, in addition to the escape from the crisis of the liberal establishment and public space, an artistic endeavor towards “reaching a higher aesthetic level unifying man and nature”.

The key notion of the Viennese artistic and intellectual discourse was the dream, which was part and parcel of the psychoanalytic investigations of the time. The relationship between psychoanalysis and the arts was reciprocal. The investigations of Sigmund Freud nurtured the work of Gustav Klimt, Arthur Schnitzler²¹ and Hugo von Hoffmanstahl to the same extent as their artistic creations influenced Freud’s understanding of the concepts of the unconscious and of the dream²².

Although there were similarities between the two capitals of the Monarchy, in Budapest, claims Hanák, the social and political arrangement was different. As in Vienna, the bourgeoisie in Budapest was mainly composed of assimilated Jewish and German immigrants threatened by the weakening of the developing but limited liberal system under the attacks of anti-Semitic and post-liberal political forces. In contrast to Austria, though, in Hungary the bourgeoisie had never usurped the role of the traditional political class, the nobility. In this sense, its members could not withdraw from the political scene since they had never fully entered it. Furthermore, in contrast to Austria, feudalism was still palpable in the political and social reality of Hungary, not as the impersonal Austrian bureaucratic system of Kafka’s Castle. The essential difference between the Garden and the Workshop was the fundamentally different political atmosphere in Hungary, where the intellectuals saw the liberal legislation as emancipatory from the remnants of the feudal system. Therefore, the social orientation of the sciences and of the arts was congruent with the progressive atmosphere of Hungarian politics –at least until the end of the nineteenth century. The design of liberal political and artistic thought took place in the public sphere: in offices of newspapers, clubs and coffeehouses. Although there were exceptions, Hanák rightly observed that political involvement on a social and national level was common to all segments of the intellectual and artistic environment.

The modernization of all aspects of the national life was a shared endeavor of the progressive spirit of the ‘second reformist generation’, whose epicenter was undoubtedly Budapest. The orientation of modernist literary styles such as Symbolism, adopted in Hungary only from the first decade of the twentieth century, or Secession was public. Anti-clericalism, anti-feudalism, belief in progress and their expression in an avant-garde fashion were the core values of the newly established journals, such as the *Nyugat* (West) and the *Hét* (Week) in literature, *Huszadik Század* (Twentieth Century) in sociology, and the theatre of the *Vígszínház* and especially the *Thália*. The representation of elements from the past in the music of Bartók or Kodály and in the architecture of Ödön Lechner was done in modern forms aiming at the regeneration of the national culture. An additional progressive scientific forum was the medical review *Gyógyászat* (Medicine) edited by Miksa Schächter, and later by Lajos Lévi -Ferenczi’s personal physician. Initiated as an alternative to

20.- In this context, Mária Kovács writes about Bertrand Russell’s and Friedrich Hayek’s concerns at the beginning of the twentieth century about the statist and post-liberal radical tendencies adopted by the state technocrats out of their absolute positivist belief in the possibility of scientific theories influencing society. Mária Kovács, *Liberalizmus, Radikalizmus, Antiszemitizmus, A Magyar Orvosi, Ügyvédi és Mérnöki Kar Politikája 1867 és 1945 között* [Liberalism, Radicalism, Anti-Semitism: The Policy of the Hungarian Medical, Bar and Engineer Associations between 1867 and 1945] (Budapest: Helikon Kiadó, 2001), 12-13.

21.- For a detailed discussion of the parallel traits of psychoanalysis in the writings of Arthur Schnitzler and of Sigmund Freud, see Nyíri Kristóf, “The Twilight of the Liberal Anthropology”, in *On the Intellectual Life of the Monarchy: Philosophical and Historical Treaties* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1980), 141-142.

22.- Péter Hanák, “The Garden and the Workshop”, in *The Garden and the Workshop: Essays on the Cultural History of Vienna and Budapest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 64-66, 68-74.

Orvosi Hetilap (Medical Weekly), the established medical journal, *Gyógyászat* was more than ready to publish psychoanalytic articles²³. A complex perception of reality brought much of the literary elite closer to psychoanalysis and a radically new conception of language, which at least until the end of the Great War was essentially in the service of the Magyar nation and its rejuvenation. The undertaking of emancipating Hungarian society from its feudal remnants transformed the slogan of Viennese Sezession, “Liberty to art”, into “Liberty to the people”²⁴.

Concerning Freud’s intellectual and social position specifically, Hanák views Freud’s marginality as an important factor in his achievements, and his role in the history of ideas -unlike others in the field of psychology such as Richard von Krafft- Ebing or Pierre Marie Félix Janet- as fundamental. Freud, while a product of bourgeois culture, radically criticized its core conceptions, and out of this contradiction psychoanalysis was born. The incompleteness of the Jewish emancipation, in both a legislative and social sense, vouchsafed a special perspective on society to the marginal figure of the Jewish intellectual. In Freud’s words: “Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which restricted others in the use of their intellect; and as a Jew I was prepared to join the opposition and to do so without agreement with the ‘compact majority’”. Hanák assumes, to a certain extent, the uniqueness of being a member of the Jewish minority in the post-assimilatory and post-liberal European bourgeois society. In this context, Jewish marginality can be regarded “as a special case of human marginality, a stage of independence and integrity that offers marginal men a sort of cognitive privilege”²⁵.

Like Schorske, Hanák is also criticized for alleged selectiveness in choosing his intellectual and cultural figures and phenomena to illustrate his theory. Steven Beller maintains that picking Gustav Mahler and Victor Adler in the case of Vienna –as McGrath does – and the ‘Sunday circle’ of Lukács in the case of Budapest, could bring Hanák to a completely inverse theory, Vienna as the Forum and Budapest as the Garden²⁶.

Yet Nyíri Kristóf, examining Ferenczi’s vision of psychoanalysis, discerns the same socially oriented outlook as the one depicted by Hanák. According to Nyíri, Ferenczi from the very beginning thought about the social implications of psychoanalysis. In a 1911 publication, he spoke of alcoholism as a symptom of a social neurosis and not as its cause. Social alcoholism could be healed, Ferenczi maintained, only by discovering the social reason for it through analysis²⁷. During the same year, in an article in *Szabadgondolat* (Free Thought) -a periodical of the ‘Galilei circle’, a progressive student organization of fin-de-siècle Budapest- he gave his view of the importance of social awareness and education on psychological matters:

Impediment of the human passion, diminishing the charge of the soul, prevention of distempers, are no longer the questions of an abstract science, but the indicators of new and hopeful directions for the prosperity and development of humanity in the future.... The future will bring a radical reform of psychical education...and this will bring the end of a period of humanity which is characterized by hypocrisy, by the blind worship of dogmas and authorities and by the absence of self-criticism²⁸.

THEORIES ABOUT FREUD’S JEWISH IDENTITY

I now turn to the existing literature on Freud’s Jewish identity in the light of the Freud- Ferenczi correspondence. Questions about Jewish social and individual identity in the context of the psychoanalytic movement, its members and Sigmund Freud himself have been examined at length²⁹. Different scholars have differently assessed the influence of the Jewish factor on the ideological and social activity of Freud and other members of the psychoanalytic movement. I will briefly outline the theories of those historians whose work I found most fruitful. Peter Gay, one of the prominent biographers of Freud, strongly disclaimed any essential influence not only of the Jewish issue but also of the Viennese cultural environment on Freudian thought. Gay arrives at his conclusions while being well aware, among other things, of Freud’s intense thinking about his Jewish identity, of his involvement and declarations in B’nai B’rith in Vienna and of his

23.- Michelle Moreau-Ricaud, “The Founding of the Budapest School”, in Peter L. Rudnytsky, Antal Bókay and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutch, eds., *Ferenczi’s Turn in Psychoanalysis* (New York University Press, 1996), 46.

24.- Hanák, “The Garden and the Workshop”, 66-67, 77-94.

25.- *Ibid.*, 161-166.

26.- Beller, “Owls Fly by Night”, 672.

27.- Nyíri, “A Liberális Antropológia Alkonya”, 148.

28.- *Ibid.*, 145-146 (the translation is mine).

29.- In addition to those analyzed in detail in this paper: David Bakan, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (New York: Schocken, 1969); John Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility* (New York: Basic Books, 1974); Marthe Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud’s Jewish Identity* (New York: Anchor Books, 1976).

thoughts on Jewish marginality in the specific socio-cultural context of fin-de-siècle Vienna³⁰.

“Freud, I conclude, was a Jew but not a Jewish scientist. I have no intention of imitating him by trying to take Freud away from his people as he tried to take away Moses. But the decisive distinction between personal identity and scientific allegiance remains intact”³¹. The Jewish theme is much more vital to Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, who inquired into Freud’s intellectual and social attitudes. In his book *Freud’s Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*, Yerushalmi finds Freud’s feelings about Judaism to be crucial to his intellectual work, having their origins in his relationship with his father. Yerushalmi considers Freud’s intellectual journey from *The Future of an Illusion* to *Moses and Monotheism* to be parallel to the emotional road that Freud traversed with regard to the memory of his father’s Jewish identity.

An additional key element in Yerushalmi’s analysis of *Moses and Monotheism* is the question of the historical dimension of Freud’s ‘historical novel’. Yerushalmi claims that Freud was, above all, interested in how Jewish tradition was passed from generation to generation. The “axis of the book [is] the problem of tradition, not merely its origins, but above all its dynamics”³². In Yerushalmi’s view, Freud devised in *Moses and Monotheism* a radically alternative explanation of history. “*Moses and Monotheism* is not merely history, but a countertheology of history in which, the Chain of Tradition is replaced by the chain of unconscious repetition. Indeed, that is perhaps why some will say that Freud has a better claim than Spinoza to be considered the archheretic of Judaism in modern times”³³.

It is the Lamarckian understanding of Freud (and Ferenczi) that confirms Yerushalmi’s claim that, in the expression “godless Jew” used by Freud, “the noun must be taken at least as seriously as the adjective”³⁴. Freud’s very words written to Zweig about the Land of Israel are apposite here: “and we hail from there...our forebears lived there for perhaps a whole millennium...and it is impossible to say what heritage from this land we have taken over into our blood and nerves”³⁵.

In his book *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytical Movement*, Dennis B. Klein assigns an emphasis to the Jewish issue that is as strong as that of Yerushalmi. Klein is particularly interested in Freud’s social and cultural orientation and that of other members of the psychoanalytic movement, first and foremost Otto Rank. Klein underlines the assertion of collective Jewish identity and solidarity among the members of the movement by noting their close association with B’nai B’rith. Klein also highlights the ambivalence of the Jewish collective identity in the post-liberal era, using Jacob Katz’s analysis of the colliding expectations of non-Jewish society on the one hand and Jews on the other. According to Klein, the disillusionment over the breakdown of the Viennese liberal political order in the latter nineteenth century fostered the development of a Jewish self-pride, which raised doubts among the non-Jewish society about the credibility of the universalistic arguments of the secular Jewish intelligentsia. The universal and humanistic efforts of these Jewish intellectuals, Klein asserts, continued to exist, albeit now conceptualized on the basis of strengthened self-pride.

In other words, the *Zielbewusstsein* or ultimate objective remained the same: social integration, but along with an increased accent on self-dignity and collective identity. During its initial years, the goal of the psychoanalytic movement for many of its Jewish members was to bring “analytical redemption”, liberating humanity from depression by curing its crucial disease: neurosis³⁶.

Another historian who found the Jewish issue critical to Freud’s theories and to the psychoanalytic movement was Sander L. Gilman. His argument focuses on the question of language. Gilman asserts that Freud, by adopting the scientific language of psychoanalysis, aimed at distancing himself from the anti-Semitic socio-cultural environment of fin-de-siècle Vienna. Freud discovered the sexual origins of neurosis through the sexual discourse of Jewish jokes told by Jews of East European origin, *los Ostjuden*³⁷. But Freud, as a Jew threatened by the anti-Semitic racial discourse of science and of post-liberal politics, did not discuss the language of Jewish jokes in a feminine language, in a Jewish language or in the accepted scientific one. He did so in a new scientific language: that of psychoanalysis, which aims at becoming a universal language,

30.- Peter Gay, *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, in association with Hebrew Union College Press, 1987), 117-154. See Yerushalmi’s critique of Gay’s theory on Freud in Yerushalmi, *Freud’s Moses*, 115-116.

31.- Gay, *A Godless Jew*, 148.

32.- Yerushalmi, *Freud’s Moses*, 29.

33.- *Ibid.*, 29-33.

34.- *Ibid.*, 116.

35.- *Ibid.*, 35.

36.- Dennis B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytical Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 138-154.

37.- The theme of the *Ostjuden* is crucial to understanding the Jewish question in turn-of-the-century Central Europe. On its origins and formulations, see Steven E. Aschheim, *Brothers and Strangers* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982).

e language of the unconscious, present in every human being³⁸. “The exercise of collecting and retelling the Jewish jokes, of removing them from the daily world in which Freud must live to the higher plane of the new scientific discourse, that of psychoanalysis enables Freud to purge himself of the insecurity felt by his status as a Jew in fin-de-siècle Vienna”³⁹.

Indeed, Freud’s scientific discourse has to be seen in the context of the scientific discourse of his time. Gilman criticizes Frank J. Sulloway⁴⁰ and Peter Gay because, he argues, they did not appreciate the importance of the racial element of the fin-de-siècle scientific discourse. He mentions Cesare Lombroso and Rafael Becker, two Jewish scientists who themselves wrote in this mode. Masculinity became connected with the Aryan race, while the Jewish male was characterized with feminine and sickly attributes such as nervosa and other such diseases.

For a Jew, to become a man of science could be his emancipating ticket to masculinity⁴¹. Freud’s constant criticism of the values of the bourgeois society ‘from inside’ is confirmed by Gilman as well: “It is necessary to understand that Freud on one level of his self-definition as Jew and scientist accepted the centrality of race as an epistemological category while constantly needing to draw it into question”⁴².

DISCUSSION

The Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, which began in 1908 and ended only in 1933 with Ferenczi’s early death, is an enormous intellectual but also socio-cultural documentation of the disintegrating Monarchy, much beyond the specific personal context of the two authors. Ferenc Erős suggests that the correspondence can also be seen as an identity project of psychoanalysis at the turn of the century. Alluding to Paul Ricoeur and Robert Musil, he argues that the identity of the ‘individual without qualities’ becomes a personal narrative in a liberal society without clear categories. The mutual nature of the correspondence, he asserts, enables Ferenczi and Freud to construct a common narrative⁴³.

The literature on Ferenczi and on the Freud-Ferenczi nexus is relatively limited. The reasons for this are diverse. The main reason is the political situation in Hungary during the communist era after the Second World War, when the intellectual activity of the psychoanalytic movement was considered illegitimate. Another reason for the lack of research is that the Freud-Ferenczi correspondence was only published during the 1990s, over half a century after it took place.

An additional explanation lies in the personal conflicts between the members of the committee around Freud. From the 1920s on, the relationship between Freud and Ferenczi deteriorated significantly as scientific differences intertwined with personal disagreements. Ernest Jones, who was Freud’s first and most important biographer, and was in a bitter rivalry with Ferenczi and Rank, attributed this distancing of Freud and Ferenczi s to serious psychological problems of Ferenczi⁴⁴.

As a non-Jew, Jones had a special position in Freud’s circle, though Jones did not see it as posing a problem. His account indicates how persistent the Jewish theme was within the circle.

We were all freethinkers so there was no religious bar between us. Nor do I remember finding any difficulty from being the only Gentile in the circle. Coming myself of an oppressed [Welsh] race it was easy for me to identify myself with the Jewish outlook which years of intimacy enabled me to absorb in a high degree. My knowledge of Jewish anecdotes, wise sayings and jokes became under such tutelage so extensive as to create astonishment among other analysts outside this small circle⁴⁵.

Concerning the Jewish members of the circle and their sensitivity to the anti-Semitic atmosphere, Jones wrote: “I became aware, somewhat to my astonishment, of how extraordinarily suspicious Jews could be of the faintest sign of anti-Semitism and of how many remarks or actions could be interpreted in that sense.

38.- Sander L. Gilman, “Freud and the Hidden Language of the Jews”, *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought* 7, no. 4 (1984): 591-614; Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred, Anti-Semitism, and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 259-270.

39.- Gilman, “Freud and the Hidden Language of the Jews”, 611.

40.- Frank J. Sulloway, *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

41.- Sander L. Gilman, *Freud, Race, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 3-11.

42.- *Ibid.*, 10.

43.- Ferenc Erős, “Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia felbomlásának képei a Freud-Ferenczi levelezés tükrében”, in *Kultuszok a pszichoanalízis történetében, Egy Ferenczi-Monográfia vázlata* [“Pictures of the Disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in the Mirror of the Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence”, in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: József Könyvek, 2004), 128-129.

44.- Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1961), 479, 493-494.

45.- *Ibid.*, 333.

The members most sensitive were Ferenczi and Sachs; Abraham and Rank were less so. Freud himself was pretty sensitive in this respect⁴⁶.

In his book *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis*, Ferenc Erős reconstructs Erich Fromm's endeavor in the 1950s to rehabilitate Ferenczi with the help of Ferenczi's students and patients. Fromm was among the first figures of the psychoanalytic movement to be excluded from it at Jones's insistence. He characterized Jones's attempt to attribute the Freud-Ferenczi disagreements to Ferenczi's alleged psychological problems as "the Stalinist rewriting of history". Fromm was equally angry at Mihály Bálint, disciple of Ferenczi and emissary of his inheritance, for not disproving Jones's claims unequivocally. Jones's biography of Freud made a major contribution for decades to Ferenczi's neglect within the psychoanalytic movement⁴⁷.

Before turning to additional research on Ferenczi, generally written by emigrants from Hungary who were personally connected to his heritage, a note on the biographical traits of the two thinkers is in order. The life stories of Freud and Ferenczi have, in fact, a good deal in common. Ferenczi's father, Baruch Frankel, was born in Galicia, in the same socio-cultural environment where Freud's father was born. Being children of second-generation Jewish emigrants had far-reaching consequences both for Freud and Ferenczi in terms of their linguistic awareness. Eva Brabant notes that the fathers of both men grew up in a Yiddish-speaking environment and had difficulties adapting to the German and the Hungarian lingual environment. She also mentions Ferenczi's sensitivity during his childhood about his father's accent⁴⁸. Presumably, in this context, a lot more was said and heard than what was or could actually be put on paper⁴⁹.

Baruch Frankel immigrated to Hungary and actively participated in the 1848 revolution; thereafter he acquired an important bookshop and publishing house in the city of Miskolc in northeastern Hungary. The Ferenczi family made a significant contribution to Hungarian literary life, which ended only in 1944 when Ferenczi's brother Károly was murdered in Auschwitz. Ferenczi himself was part of Freud's sociocultural milieu during his years as a student. He chose to be a doctor, a profession much cherished by the children of families from an East European Jewish background, and he completed his medical studies in Vienna. Some 30 percent of the medical students in Vienna at the turn of the century were indeed from a similar social background as Ferenczi⁵⁰.

The Freud-Ferenczi correspondence conveys the impression that for Jews, a medical career was a crucial "emancipatory path"⁵¹. Nevertheless, Jewish intellectuals, such as Ferenczi, remained somewhat distanced from it, or at least critical of it. In a letter to Freud on December 7, 1909, Ferenczi thanks him for writing an introduction to his book, saying he is very satisfied with it but has made a minor change: "I have added a word; at the place where you note that I am the first Hungarian who etc.... wants to initiate 'the man of education in his own country', I want to have printed 'the doctors and the men of education in his own country'. I don't want this book to be described as 'popular science'. Probably no one will notice that in doing so, the doctors will be removed from the circle of the educated (even though this ironic conception would not be inappropriate)"⁵².

Later, one of the points of dispute between Freud and Ferenczi was the authority of the analyst over the patient, and Ferenczi's desire to institute a more democratic relationship between them. Gilman and Michel Foucault later made similar criticisms of the bourgeois institution of the medical doctor.

46.- Ibid., 333.

47.- Ferenc Erős, "Ferenczi, Fromm és 'a történelem sztálinista újráirása'", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében*, Egy Ferenczi-Monográfia Vázlata ["Ferenczi, Fromm and the 'Stalinist rewriting of history'", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis*] (Budapest: Jószyveg Könyvek, 2004), 53-72; Erich Fromm, *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis: Essays on Freud, Marx, and Social Psychology* (New York: H. Holt, 1991), 19-22.

48.- Eva Brabant, "Má nistanö, avagy mi marad meg?" in *A megtalált nyelv* ["Ma Nishtana, or What Remains?" in *The Found Language*], Ritter Andrea and Ferenc Erős, eds. (Budapest: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, 2001), 150-151.

49.- As an illustration of how much the theme of the Ostjuden was central to the Viennese political discourse of the time, Brabant mentions Victor Adler's reaction to the proposal of numerus clausus against Jews in the 1880s. The future Jewish figure of Austrian socialism proposed distinguishing between the already assimilated Jews and the newly immigrated ones, the Ostjuden, Brabant, "Má nistanö, avagy mi marad meg?" 152-153.

50.- Ferenc Erős, "Egy vásott kölyök az ismeretlen tartományból", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében*, Egy Ferenczi-Monográfia Vázlata ["A Pickle from the Unknown Province", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: Jószyveg Könyvek, 2004), 8183.

51.- The phrase is borrowed from Pierre Birnbaum and Ira Katznelson, eds., "Introduction", *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States and Citizenship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 3-36.

52.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, December 7, 1909, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 1, 1908-1914, Eva Brabant, Ernst Falzeder and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch, eds, under the supervision of André Haynal (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992), 111.

PSYCHOANALYSIS BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

After returning to Hungary, Ferenczi began to work as a psychiatrist in the public health service, specifically in the St. Rókus Hospital, in Budapest, in the department for prostitutes with sexual diseases. Subsequently from 1900 he worked in the Erzsébet Poor- House and Hospital, in Budapest, in the department of neurology and psychiatry. From 1904 to 1910, he was in charge of neurological outpatient treatment at the Healthcare Institution in Budapest. From 1905 till after the end of the Great War, he worked as a neurological expert at the Budapest Court of Justice⁵³.

Here it is worth investigating the relationship between the state and the psychoanalytic movement in Hungary. The results of inquiries of this sort could shed light on the validity of Hanák's theory about the socially obligated intellectual approach in Budapest. I base my investigation on the research of Mária Kovács, who explored the policies of the associations of doctors, engineers and lawyers vis-à-vis the state and vis-à-vis the minorities in Hungary, mainly the Jews. Kovács's conclusion regarding the medical branches is equally relevant to the psychoanalysts of the time. Although Freud and Ferenczi were in favor of lay analysis – one of the main debates of the formative years of the psychoanalytic movement – at the time nearly all analysts were graduates of medical faculties. Therefore, the results of Kovács's investigations regarding Jewish medical doctors and the Hungarian state pertain directly to the relations between the psychoanalysts and the state professional associations.

Kovács surveys the history of the free professions in Hungary from 1867 -the year of the so-called Compromise between Austria and Hungary- till the end of the Second World War. Concerning the period from 1867 until the end of the Communist Republic in 1919, Kovács gives the following account. The Hungarian state implemented a policy to create more liberal market conditions than even in Western Europe; Kovács's main counterexample in this regard is England. In Western Europe, the associations of the free professions succeeded in preserving most of their privileges attained in the Middle Ages. In contrast, in Hungary, associational life was very limited during the different absolutist periods that Hungary experienced under Habsburg rule, and after 1867 there was no associational infrastructure of the free professions. The relations between associations such as the Magyar Orvosi Kör (Hungarian Medical Circle), which were established in the post-1867 period, and the state remained till 1920 on a liberal theoretical basis. The main aim of the Hungarian Medical Circle was to establish a General Medical Association

– on the model of the medieval guilds – which would unite the doctors in their struggle against the Healthcare Institutions that drew more and more of the market of patients, giving the patients a favorable bargaining position vis-à-vis the doctors. Regarding the Jewish question, the official policy was liberal but the issue of the high percentage of Jewish free-professionals was a sensitive one. At the turn of the century, Jewish medical students constituted close to half the overall number of students. This was especially delicate when the free professions, at least according to the 1848 reformist ideas of the nobility, were supposed to be filled by the young generation of the gentry. In actuality, they began to enter these professions only a generation after the Jewish youth did. The issue of regulating the number of professionals became even more acute after the Peace Treaty of 1920, when their percentage of the population was even higher than before the war. There were also additional professionals who immigrated to Hungary from the territories that were allocated to the surrounding countries. Although there were avant- garde neoconservative groups among the free-professionals who criticized the dominant liberal ideology, their influence was limited; an example was József Madzsar, who was among the first scientists to propagate eugenics in Hungary. The idea of *numerus clausus* in the medical professions - and those of engineering and law- was proposed before 1914 out of purely professional considerations of regulating the quantity of professionals in each field, and not out of ethnic or racial considerations⁵⁴.

The situation changed dramatically after the communist revolution of 1919. With the establishment of the neoconservative Horthy regime the first *numerus clausus* law in Europe was legislated that was designed according to racial and ethnic considerations. The law had substantial support from race-defending organizations, which were already established in an underground form during the 133 days of the 1919 Béla Kun regime.

One of the prominent organizations of this sort was the MONE (Magyar Orvosok Nemzeti Egyesülete, the National Association of Hungarian Doctors), headed by András Csilléry, which already during the communist regime began to prepare “lists of physicians with a sure Hungarian pedigree”. With the establishment of the Bethlen administration, Csilléry received the medical portfolio. Along with actively backing the legislation

53.- Harmat, Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis, 33.

54.- Kovács, Liberalizmus, Radikalizmus, Antiszemitizmus, 21-37, 45-66.

of the *numerus clausus*, MONE was willing to banish Jewish physicians from the state sector, leaving the practice in the framework of the Healthcare Institutions to non-Jewish doctors only. Ironically, this measure was, in a sense, beneficial to the Jewish physicians after the 1929 economic crisis, when the private sector was no doubt preferable to the bankrupted state sector.

The general Physicians' Association was established only in 1932, in the spirit of the corporatist state-reforms of the Gömbös administration. Not surprisingly it was András Csilléry in March 1938 who submitted the proposal for the First Jewish Law in Hungary, aimed at depriving the Jews of their citizenship on a racial basis⁵⁵.

Indeed, the Hungarian psychoanalytic movement's or individual analysts' relations with the Hungarian state confirm Kovács's analysis. The climax in the Hungarian psychoanalytic movement's relations with the state came, no doubt, at the end of the First World War. On September 28-29, 1918 the Fifth International Congress of Psychoanalysis took place in Budapest. Its central theme was war neurosis (PTSD), and along with the central figures of the psychoanalytical movement, high-ranking officials from the Imperial, the Hungarian and the Prussian ministries of defense took part. Abraham, Simmel and others presented their papers in uniform. Partly as a consequence of the conference, the Imperial Ministry of Defense published a regulation, "Building additional stations of neurology and treatment of crippled war veterans", which alluded to psychoanalytic treatment for war veterans in cases where the patient manifested resistance in more than one station of neurological treatment⁵⁶.

In the context of the psychoanalytic movement and the state, it is also worth noting that the first-ever university department of psychoanalysis was established, surprisingly enough, during the 1919 Soviet Republic in Hungary. In March 1919, Ernő Jendrassik was asked to write an opinion about a proposal submitted by students to the University of Medical Studies in Budapest on the issue of establishing a department of psychoanalysis. Jendrassik emphasized that half of the undersigned were women, and stated that nowhere in any university in the world was the "so-called" psychoanalysis taught, it actually being "pornography and dream-interpretation"⁵⁷. He said of psychoanalysis that its "main theoretical subject is the young hysterical woman, with whom they endlessly discuss sexual things, though it's known that these are highly suggestible individuals, and their analysts take their suggested memories as proving data"⁵⁸. Among the many alleged perversities of the analysts, Jendrassik specifically objected to the interpretation of the church towers in the dream as phallic symbols.

Yet, despite the negative opinion of the Department of Medical Studies, the Council of Education decided to set up a Department of Psychoanalytical Studies. The signature on the letter of appointment of Ferenczi was that of György Lukács, the deputy commissar of the Education Council, and of Tódor Kármán, responsible for academic issues, the future world known scientist of aerodynamics. The only demand of Ferenczi, who accepted the appointment as head of the department, was that he renounce his private practice. The establishment of this faculty was largely due to the warm personal and professional relationship between Ferenczi and prominent members of Béla Kun's regime.

This tendency changed dramatically after the communist revolution of 1919. Similar to the Viennese model of the prewar period, the analysts in Budapest were constrained by the state to leave their public positions and so retreated into their private clinics. In the biographical data of the members of the Hungarian association, their occupational patterns confirm the premises of Kovács. István Hollós, Ferenczi's successor after his death as president of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Movement, may have been the only one to remain briefly in the public sphere after 1919. Before the war he worked in the National Psychiatric Institution of Lipótmező and as director of a hospital in Nagyszeben in Transylvania; after the war, he was employed for a short time in the Psychiatric Hospital in Angyalföld. Hollós was among the first analysts to use psychoanalysis in the treatment of psychotics. The methods he used were based on the principles developed by Ferenczi: an active approach by the analyst and a special emphasis on empathy.

Lilly Hajdu and her husband Miklós Gimes were central figures in the Hungarian movement. They both left the public sector after the war, and Hajdu took over the Frimm Institution and until 1934 administered it as the Lilly Hajdu Institute for Special Education and Children's Camp. Lajos Lévy, the famous internal physician of Ferenczi worked in the Mária Valéria Hospital and in the Zita Hospital, and after the war was employed in the private Jewish Hospital in Budapest⁵⁹.

Typically of the Hungarian analysts, Imre Hermann also opened a private clinic after serving in the

55.- Ibid., 62- 66, 73-92, 108-118.

56.- Harmat, Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis, 85-88.

57.- Ibid., 95.

58.- Ibid., 96.

59.- Ibid., 148-157.

army till 1918, and working as the academic assistant of Géza Révész during the Soviet Republic in 1919. The public clinic of the psychoanalytic movement was inaugurated on December 18, 1931, on 12 Mészáros Street, in Budapest, in the Kovács residence. Although the clinic was financed by Vilma Kovács and other members of the movement, the Hungarian state bureaucracy still tried to impede its establishment⁶⁰. In August 1919, the neoconservative regime of Horthy and the anti-Semitic White Terror put an end to the brief renaissance of psychoanalysis in Hungary. Ferenczi was dismissed from the Physicians' Association of Budapest after twenty years of membership. The initiative to dismiss doctors who had participated in the communist revolution came from the abovementioned MONE. The same Jendrassik lobbied for Ferenczi's exclusion. The establishment of the Horthy regime sparked the first emigrations of members of the psychoanalytic movement, Hárnik and Radó; waves of emigration were to follow⁶¹.

Hanák's theory, then, is certainly valid judging by the occupational patterns of Ferenczi and other members of the psychoanalytical movement, at least until 1920. The figure of Ferenczi spending his time in Budapest's coffeehouses with the progressive writers and artists of his age very much confirms this picture. Ferenczi from the very beginning was highly sensitive to the possible social implications of psychoanalysis⁶². Later, especially after the Great War, his attitude became more and more similar to the prewar escapist Freudian stance. As he wrote to Freud on March 22, 1910, about a year and a half after they had met: "I would like to recommend to you another point for consideration (in case you haven't come upon it yourself). That is the sociological significance of our analyses in the sense that in our analyses we investigate the real conditions in the various levels of society, cleansed of all hypocrisy and conventionalism, just as they are mirrored in the individual"⁶³.

Additional instance which demonstrate the connectedness of the Hungarian Psychoanalytic Movement with the Budapest literary-public scene are the opening sessions of the association, which was established on May 19, 1913. Ernest Jones, who participated in its second session, recounts that Hugó Ignótus, a lay member of the association and editor in chief of the progressive literary review *Nyugat*, was cast in the role of the public⁶⁴.

Indeed, Budapest did not cease even after the war to be adoptive of the new science. Its main center was in Lipótváros, one of the city's main concentrations of Jewish population since the last quarter of the nineteenth century. István Vas describes a subculture in Lipótváros, in which this "secret discovery, doctrine, ceremony" in a somewhat snobbish way was constantly mentioned, not necessarily read about⁶⁵.

Without this environment, psychoanalysis and other branches of progressive culture simply could not have been adopted in Hungary for decades.

Psychoanalysis became the target of anti-Semitic, conservative, nationalistic political and public forces. Sexual conservatives projected on the Jews even "the perception of sexuality as sin". The critics of psychoanalysis had an anti-Semitic subtext, or used anti-Semitic symbolism even explicitly. As Sándor Solymossy criticized Géza Róheim, one of the prominent Budapest psychoanalysts: "The way in which [Róheim] represents before us the son of the earth is none other than the (how is the Freudian expression?) 'projection' of the antsy mental life of the man of the coffeehouse of the capital on the Hungarian farmer, an altogether different type"⁶⁶.

JEWS AND GENTILES IN THE PSYCHOANALYTIC MOVEMENT

Ferenczi met Freud for the first time in 1908, and their human and intellectual relationship quickly became intense. Eva Brabant maintains that their common Jewish background played an important rule in their relationship, though to Ferenczi in particular Freud wrote very little about Jewish issues⁶⁷. Members of the committee sometimes made explicit references to the Jewish or non-Jewish origin of certain members

60.- Ibid., 217-230.

61.- Ibid., 95-107; Erős, "Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia Felbomlásának Képei a Freud-Ferenczi Levelezés Tükrében", 138-143. For more on the waves of emigration of psychoanalysts from Hungary and their worldwide influence, see Judit Mészáros, "The Tragic Success of European Psychoanalysis: 'The Budapest School'", *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 1998, 7:207-214.

62.- Erős, "Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia Felbomlásának Képei a Freud-Ferenczi Levelezés Tükrében", 44.

63.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, March 22, 1910, *La Correspondencia de Sigmund Freud y Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 1, 153.

64.- Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 130.

65.- Harmat, *Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis*, 111.

66.- Ibid., 109-113.

67.- Brabant, "Má nistanö, avagy mi marad meg?" 150.

of the movement. These allusions, of course, intensified regarding Jung. Freud's concerns about the image of psychoanalysis as a Jewish science were well known. Seeing Jung as the ideal 'gentile crown-prince', the son of a Lutheran pastor, he had to do no little conciliation between the Jewish Viennese and the gentile analysts from Zürich. To lower the tension between Abraham and Jung, for example, Freud wrote to the former:

Please be tolerant and do not forget that it is really easier for you than it is for Jung to follow my ideas, for in the first place you are completely independent, and you are closer to my intellectual constitution because of racial kinship [Rassenverwandschaft], while he as a Christian pastor's son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances. His association with us is more valuable for that. I nearly said that it was only by his appearance on the scene that psycho-analysis escaped the danger of becoming a Jewish national affair [eine jüdisch nationale Angelegenheit]⁶⁸.

Another instance shows how sharply Freud's public statements differed from his private utterances about his Jewish feelings, even attributing specific qualities based on racial considerations. In another attempt to calm the waters between Abraham and "the Swiss", he wrote to the former on July 23, 1908:

I surmise that the repressed anti-Semitism of the Swiss, from which I am to be spared, has been directed against you in increased force. But my opinion is that we must as Jews [wir müssen als Juden], if we want to cooperate with other people, develop a little masochism and be prepared to endure a little injustice.... Why cannot I harness Jung and you together, your keenness [Ihre Schärfe] and his élan [seinen Schwung]?⁶⁹

The discussions of the Jewish and non-Jewish members of the movement were not limited to personal relations, as Yerushalmi demonstrates, but dealt with the existence or non-existence of Aryan and Jewish features in culture and science. Freud saw the dangers of a situation where these alleged features would be regarded as objective, scientifically established differences. As a positivist, Freud, at least publicly, remained undeterred in the face of the mounting post-liberal voices: Certainly there are great differences between the Jewish and the Aryan spirit. We can observe that every day. Hence there would be here and there differences in outlook on life and art. But there should not be such a thing as Aryan or Jewish science. Results in science must be identical, though the presentation of them may vary. If these differences mirror themselves in the apprehension of objective relationship in science there must be something wrong⁷⁰.

The Freud-Ferenczi correspondence includes overt allusions to issues that concern Jews and have social implications, though to a lesser extent on Freud's part. On October 30, 1909, after a lecture Ferenczi gave on *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* to the members of the Galilei Circle, he wrote to Freud: "Budapest seems after all, not to be such an absolutely bad place. The audience was naturally composed of nine tenths Jews!"⁷¹

Indeed, Freud makes much fewer allusions, at least explicitly, to the Jewish issue in this correspondence. This point is illustrated by the difference between Jones's recounting of the Nuremberg Conference in 1910 and Freud's letter to Ferenczi after the same event. During the conference, at Freud's insistence, Ferenczi gave a speech proposing the transfer of the leadership of the International Association of Psychoanalysis⁷² to the Zürich analysts. The idea arose, according to Jones, out of considerations connected to the Jewish background of the Vienna analysts. Freud thought that with gentile analysts at the upper echelon of the association, psychoanalysis would not be doomed to a parochial role. The proposal, to put it mildly, was negatively received by the Viennese. As Jones wrote:

[T]he Viennese, especially Adler and Stekel, also angrily opposed the nomination of Swiss analysts to the positions of President and Secretary, their own long and faithful services being ignored. Freud himself perceived the advantage of establishing a broader basis for the work than could be provided by his Viennese colleagues, who were all Jewish, and that it was necessary to convince the Viennese of this. Hearing that several of them held a protest meeting in Stekel's hotel room, he went up to join them and made an impassioned appeal for their adherence. He laid stress on the virulent hostility that surrounded them and the need for outside support to counter it⁷³.

However, Freud's letter to Ferenczi after the conference thanking him for the proposal sounds different,

68.- Yerushalmi, *Freud's Moses*, 42.

69.- *Ibid.*, 42-43.

70.- *Ibid.*, 43.

71.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, October 30, 1909, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 1, 92.

72.- The International Association was officially established in 1910 during the Second International Congress of Psychoanalysis in Nuremberg. Its main purpose was, in Freud's eyes, to grant a more international shade to Psychoanalysis balancing the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society's rather monolithic membership.

73.- Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 273.

without any explicit allusion to the issue of the Jewish identity of the Viennese. As Freud wrote to Ferenczi on April 3, 1910:

Your impassioned pleading had the misfortune to unleashing so much opposition that they forgot to thank you for your significant inspiration. Every society is thankless; that doesn't matter. But we are both a little at fault, since we didn't sufficiently take into account the effect this would have on the Viennese; it would have been easy to omit entirely the critical allusions and to take up the direct promise of scientific freedom, and we could have made resistance on their part rather difficult. I believe that my aversion toward the Viennese circle, which has been accumulating for a long time, and your brother complex have had the combined effect of making us shortsighted....

The infancy of our movement has ended with the Nuremberg Reichstag; that is my impression. I hope that a rich and beautiful youth is now coming⁷⁴.

The reason for this pattern is not clear. Was it because Freud and Ferenczi did not deal with the issue specifically? Considering the centrality that the issue achieves even in Jones's narrative, it makes no sense. Or was it closeness between Freud and Ferenczi that made explicit allusions to this issue unnecessary? For ultimately, with all of Freud's will to have Jung as his heir, it was Ferenczi to whom marriage with Freud's daughter was proposed and not to the analyst from Zürich. In the post-liberal socio-cultural atmosphere of the early twentieth century, the Jewish theme was inevitably a conscious issue between Freud and Ferenczi.

THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE MONARCHY

The years 1918-1920 brought the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and, especially for Ferenczi, the collapse of the socio-cultural premises of the world before the Great War. Freud's post-liberal Vienna had disillusioned him from early on about his chances of being part of German or Austrian nationalism – if such chances existed at all. The Hungarian political atmosphere, however, was different until 1918.

The post-liberal tendencies did not emerge to the forefront of the political arena before the end of the Communist Revolution of 1919. From 1867 to 1918, thanks to limited suffrage, the liberal forces dominated the Hungarian parliament and political discourse. The political ideologies and forces which in Vienna, after the expansion of the franchise, made Karl Lueger the mayor of city between 1897 and 1910, also existed in Hungary, but had to wait till the establishment of the Horthy regime to take control. At the time Lueger and the Christian Socialists came to power in Vienna, there was a Jewish mayor in Budapest. The bourgeois revolution of Count Károlyi and the dictatorship of Béla Kun had to come to their end before anti-Semitism became a dominant political feature in Hungary. In this atmosphere, it is understandable that Hungarian Jewry was still eager to promote emancipation and integration into Hungarian society. It was not until he moved to Vienna and, subsequently, to Paris that Theodor Herzl became a Zionist; until then he wrote patriotic poetry in Hungary, like Ferenczi.

To a certain extent, all this explains the social involvement of Budapest's progressive artistic milieu as claimed by Hanák, taking into consideration the high percentage of Jews in these circles⁷⁵. Because of his bitter experience in Vienna, Freud understood the developments in Hungary better than Ferenczi and tried to bring him to a 'reconsideration' of his emotional commitment to the country. Freud urged him to withdraw into the circle of psychoanalysis where there was no danger of disappointment for him because of his identity. Freud wrote to him on October 27, 1919:

I know that you are a Hungarian patriot, and you have to expect some painful experiences in that regard. It seems that the Hungarians are submitting to the deception that they alone could evade the threatened diminution because they are especially loved or respected in the world outside, in a word, that they are "exceptions".... Disappointment will not be absent and will bring bad times along with it.... Withdraw your libido from your fatherland in a timely fashion and shelter it in Psychoanalysis, or else you will have to feel uncomfortable⁷⁶.

If not Freud's urgings, then the aftermath of the Great War and the establishment of the anti-Semitic Horthy regime in Hungary in 1919 naturally intensified Ferenczi's awareness of the implications of his Jewish identity. The following letter to Freud shows just how cruel was the 'awakening from the illusion of the Era of Emancipation'. Ferenczi's position as a psychoanalyst, a Jew and as a former professor in the Bolshevik era became untenable under the White Terror. The will of those students who tried to obstruct

74.- Sigmund Freud to Sándor Ferenczi, April 3, 1910, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 1, 55-156.

75.- Ervin Junger, *Bartók és a zsidó diaszpóra, Adatok Bartók Béla művészi és társadalmi kapcsolataihoz [Bartók and the Jewish Diaspora: Data on the Artistic and Social Connections of Béla Bartók]* (Budapest: MTA Judaisztikai Kutatócsoport, 1997), 7-50.

76.- Sigmund Freud to Sándor Ferenczi, October 27, 1919, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 2, 304.

the progressive Gyula Pikler's lectures in the university around 1900⁷⁷ was achieved by means of legislation – the numerus clausus Law – and through terror in the public space. Ferenczi wrote to Freud on August 28, 1919:

After the unbearable 'Red terror', which lay heavy on one's spirit like a nightmare, we now have the White one. For a short time it seemed as if they would succeed in moderating the parties toward a just compromise, but in the end the ruthless clerical-anti-Semitic spirit seems to have eked out a victory. If everything does not deceive, we Hungarian Jews are now facing a period of brutal persecution of Jews. They will, I think, have cured us in a very short time of the illusion with which we were brought up, namely, that we are 'Hungarians of Jewish faith'. I picture Hungarian anti-Semitism – commensurate with the national character – to be more brutal than the petty-hateful type of the Austrians.

It will very soon become evident how one can live and work here. It is naturally the best thing for Psychoanalysis, to continue working in complete withdrawal and without noise. Personally, one will have to take this trauma as an occasion to abandon certain prejudices brought along from the nursery and to come to terms with the bitter truth of being, as a Jew, really, without a country.... The police jails are full of anonymously reported 'Bolshevists', who are being mistreated there. The blackest reaction prevails at the university. All Jewish assistants were fired, the Jewish students were thrown out and beaten. From these few data you may get a picture of the situation that prevails here!⁷⁸

These lines are important mostly as testimony to these turbulent times as viewed by Jews in the disintegrated Monarchy. Fourteen years later, two months before Ferenczi died, it was he who urged Freud to leave Austria. His premonition about the years to come in Vienna was no less valid than Freud's forewarning about post-war Hungary. Influenced by the political developments in Germany, Ferenczi wrote to Freud on March 29, 1933:

I advise you to make use of the time of the not yet immediately dangerously threatening situation and, with a few patients and your daughter Anna, to go to a more secure country, perhaps England.... I, myself, am harboring the idea, in the event that the political danger gets closer to Budapest, of, at the proper time, going to Switzerland, where some patients who are still capable of paying will accompany me.... Please take my warning seriously⁷⁹

The question of identity became more and more relevant to Freud and Ferenczi as the post-liberal political trends came to threaten the Jews of Central Europe. After the collapse of the pre-war political reality, Ferenczi retreated into his Jewish identity from his Hungarian one, which was denied him by anti-Semitic Hungarian nationalism. In the following lines by Ferenczi to Freud on October 4, 1919, Ferenczi discerns along with his Jewish ego a psychoanalytic one. Similarly to the professional identity of a physician, this psychoanalytic ego served as well to impart a social respectability, even if no longer accepted by the society: "The beginning of the breakdown of our old political world, among other things also of the *Glubus Hungaricus*, is deeply injuring our narcissism. It is a good thing that one has a Jewish and a psychoanalytic ego along with the Hungarian, which remain untouched by these events"⁸⁰.

A more subtle feature is discernable throughout the literature on the history of the psychoanalytic movement in Central Europe. Ferenc Erős maintains that the psychoanalytic movement in Hungary owed its underground survival during the fascist and the communist regime to the inspiration of Ferenczi's teaching. Erős notes Ferenczi's emphasis on primordial feelings of love, connection and relationship as deriving from the early connection between mother and child. These mother-type feelings, Erős claims, linked the members of the movement together in their resistance against the father-type collective authoritative state⁸¹.

The same 'family' motif is present in Michelle Moreau-Ricaud's article on the foundation of the Budapest School and its difficult history in the interwar period. She describes the "extended-family" type gatherings of the movement's twenty-four members at Ferenczi's home – ironically, on the occasion of Christmas in the 1920s⁸². In the same spirit, Freud in 1933 characterized his relationship with Ferenczi, just months before

77.- On the Pikler affair and the Galilei circle, see Zsigmond Kende, *A Galilei Kör Meglakulása* [The Formation of the Galilei Circle] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974), 67-70.

78.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, August 28, 1919, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 2, 365-366.

79.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, March 29, 1933, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 3, 447-448.

80.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, October 4, 1919, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 2, 297.

81.- Erős, "Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia Felbomlásának Képei a Freud-Ferenczi Levezetés Tükrében", 50-51.

82.- Michelle Moreau-Ricaud, "The Founding of the Budapest School", in Peter L. Rudnytsky, Antal Bókay and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutch, eds., *Ferenczi's Turn in Psychoanalysis* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 55.

the latter's death, as "an intimate community of life, feeling, and interest"⁸³.

In the face of the disintegrating Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the threats posed by the post-liberal political and social environment, the Jewish self-consciousness of Freud and Ferenczi intensified. This was manifested both by Freud's intimate discourse on his Jewish identity through his inquiry on Moses, and by Ferenczi's understanding of the harsh Hungarian political conditions to the point of considering emigration to the United States. Throughout the turbulent years of the 1920s and 1930s, their friendship was a bulwark for them.

CONCLUSION

The Freud-Ferenczi correspondence is a fundamental document of the socio-cultural milieu of the early twentieth century in Central Europe. The young science of psychoanalysis and its pioneers reflected their society to the same extent that they were critical of it. Freud and Ferenczi, sons of East European Jewish immigrants, had to face the collapse of the illusion of emancipation in the liberal-bourgeois society. However, they themselves were at the same time the outcome of the same *Bildungsbürgertum* surroundings. Their faith in the feasibility of the scientific investigation of culture and the healing of the illnesses of mass society had no limits.

Amid general decay, they envisioned abiding structures that promised to lay new foundations of self-understanding, and expected these structures, whether of art or of the psyche, to outlast the flux of styles that had concealed them. They cherished the hope that at last the bedrock of artistic and psychic experience had been struck. They had unearthed, they believed, the secrets of the ages, the very foundations of cultural experience⁸⁴.

The Jewish issue in the context of the psychoanalytic movement has been researched in depth. However, incorporating the Jewish issue into the historical scheme of Schorske, Hanák and Kovács produced results in terms of our understanding of the role that the state and the public sphere played in shaping Freud's and Ferenczi's awareness of their Jewish identity. Indeed, there are interesting parallels between social phenomena and intellectual trends. The abovementioned István Hollós wrote in his autobiography that being a Jew, an outsider in the Christian society, led to his occupation with mentally handicapped people, also outsiders⁸⁵.

Although Ferenczi did not write in the field of social psychology specifically, in contrast to Freud he considered the social implications of psychoanalysis from the very beginning of his acquaintance with the new science. His social interest corresponds to Hanák's theory on the social engagement of the progressive Budapest intellectuals and artists at the turn of the century. However, this tendency came to an end, at least for the psychoanalytic movement in Hungary, after the Great War. This resulted directly from the change in the state policies, which in turn was a response to demands made in the public sphere, especially by free-professionals. In contrast to Ferenczi, Freud moved from an escapist intellectual stance towards exploring the social repercussions of psychoanalysis⁸⁶. It is appropriate to close with an additional opinion on Schorske's historiography. Michael S. Roth argues that Schorske, historian of ahistorical Viennese modernism, restored the historical dimension to the discourse on modernism by emphasizing the "formative political-cultural experiences" of the influential figures of the Viennese socio-cultural environment. "In [Schorske's] hands... history fights back with the tools of psychology and aesthetics, showing that even the modernist retreat from the historical can become a fertile field of reflection for the historian. Thus fin-de-siècle Vienna presents modernist contextual histories that reenact the confrontation of modernism and historicism"⁸⁷.

In the case of the psychoanalysts who wanted to replace their personal identity with a universal scientific self and an ahistorical understanding of the human condition, their historical legacy remained attached to them, and the post-liberal society considered it more important than their universalistic ideology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY PRIMARY SOURCES

Brabant, Eva, Falzeder, Ernst and Giampieri, Patrizia-Deutsch, eds., under the supervision of André Haynal, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 1, 1908-1914 (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994).

83.- Sándor Ferenczi to Sigmund Freud, January 11, 1933, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 3, 446.

84.- Johnson, "Cultivated Gardeners", 260.

85.- Harmat, *Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis*, 150-151.

86.- *Ibid.*, 132-133.

87.- Michael S. Roth, "Performing History", *American Historical Review* (June 1994): 733.

- Brabant, Eva and Falzeder, Ernst, eds., with the collaboration of Giampieri, PatriziaDeutsch, under the supervision of André Haynal, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 2, 1914-1919 (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996).
- Brabant, Eva and Falzeder, Ernst, eds., with the collaboration of Giampieri, PatriziaDeutsch, under the supervision of André Haynal, *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi*, vol. 3, 1920-1933 (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000).

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Aschheim, Steven E., *Brothers and Strangers* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982).
- Bakan, David, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (New York: Schocken, 1969).
- Beller, Steven, "Owls Fly by Night: Recent Literature on Fin de Siècle Vienna", *Historical Journal* 31, no. 3 (September 1988): 665-683.
- Berman, Immanuel, "haKol ha'Aher: Sándor Ferenczi uTrumato laTipul", in Sándor Ferenczi, Bilbul haSafot ben haMevuggarim laYeled [Berman, Immanuel, "The Other Voice: The Contribution of Sándor Ferenczi to Treatment", in Sándor Ferenczi, *Confusion of Tongues between Adults and Child, Essays 1908-1933*], (Tel Aviv: Hotzaat Am Oved, 2005), 11-70.
- Birnbaum, Pierre and Katznelson, Ira, eds., "Introduction", in *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States and Citizenship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).
- Brabant, Eva, "Má nistanö, avagy mi marad meg?" in *A megtalált nyelv* ["Ma Nishtana, or What Remains?" in *The Found Language*], Ritter Andrea and Ferenc Erös, eds. (Budapest: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, 2001). Cuddihy, John, *The Ordeal of Civility* (New York: Basic Books, 1974).
- Erös, Ferenc, "Egy vásott kölyök az ismeretlen tartományból", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében, Egy Ferenczi-Monográfia Vázlata* ["A Pickle from the Unknown Province", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: Józseveg Könyvek, 2004), 73-102.
- Erös, Ferenc, "Ferenczi, Fromm és 'a történelem sztálinista újírása'", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében, Egy Ferenczi-Monográfia Vázlata* ["Ferenczi, Fromm and the 'Stalinist Rewriting of History'", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis*] (Budapest: Józseveg Könyvek, 2004), 53-72.
- Erös, Ferenc, "Miért Ferenczi?" in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében, Egy Ferenczi Monográfia Vázlata* ["Why Ferenczi?" in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: Józseveg Könyvek, 2004), 33-52.
- Erös, Ferenc, "Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia felbomlásának képei a Freud-Ferenczi levelezés tükrében", in *Kultuszok a Pszichoanalízis Történetében, Egy Ferenczi Monográfia Vázlata* ["Pictures of the Disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in the Mirror of the Freud-Ferenczi Correspondence", in *Cults in the History of Psychoanalysis: A Draft for a Ferenczi Monograph*] (Budapest: Józseveg Könyvek, 2004), 125-146.
- Fromm, Erich, *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis: Essays on Freud, Marx, and Social Psychology* (New York: H. Holt, 1991).
- Gay, Peter, *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, in association with Hebrew Union College Press, 1987).
- Gilman, Sander L., "Freud and the Hidden Language of the Jews", *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought* 7, no. 4 (1984): 591-614.
- Gilman, Sander L., *Freud, Race, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- Gilman, Sander L., *Jewish Self-Hatred, Anti-Semitism, and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).
- Gluck, Mary, "Rethinking Culture in Central Europe", *Austrian History Yearbook* 28 (1997): 217-222.
- Hanák, Péter, "The Garden and the Workshop", in *The Garden and the Workshop: Essays on the Cultural History of Vienna and Budapest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).
- Harmat, Pál, *Freud, Ferenczi és a magyarországi Pszichoanalízis, A Budapesti Mélylélektani Iskola Története* [Freud, Ferenczi and Psychoanalysis in Hungary: The History of the Psychoanalytic School of Budapest] (Budapest: Bethlen Gábor Könyvkiadó, 1994).
- Jones, Ernest, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1961). Junger, Ervin, *Bartók és a zsidó diaszpóra, Adatok Bartók Béla művészi és társadalmi kapcsolataihoz* [Bartók and the Jewish Diaspora: Data on the Artistic and Social Connections of Béla Bartók] (Budapest: MTA Judaisztikai Kutatocsoport, 1997).
- Kende, Zsigmond, *A Galilei Kör Meglakulása* [The Formation of the Galilei Circle] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974).
- Klein, Dennis B., *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytical Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

1985).

- Kovács, Mária, *Liberalizmus, Radikalizmus, Antiszemitizmus, A Magyar Orvosi, Ügyvédi és Mérnöki Kar Politikája 1867 és 1945 között* [Liberalism, Radicalism, Anti-Semitism: The Policy of the Hungarian Medical, Bar and Engineering Associations between 1867 and 1945] (Budapest: Helikon Kiadó, 2001).
- Laqueur, Walter, review of "Fin-de-siècle Vienna", by Carl E. Schorske, *Society* 18, no. 1 (November/December 1980): 89-91.
- Marthe, Robert, *From Oedipus to Moses: Freud's Jewish Identity* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1976).
- McGrath, William J., *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
- Mészáros, Judit, "The Tragic Success of European Psychoanalysis: 'The Budapest School'", *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 1998, 7:207-214.
- Moreau-Ricaud, Michelle, "The Founding of the Budapest School", in Peter L. Rudnytsky, Antal Bókay and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutch, eds., *Ferenczi's Turn in Psychoanalysis* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 41-59.
- Nyíri, Kristóf, "A Liberális Antropológia Alkonya", in *A Monarchia szellemi életéről, Filozófiai Történeti Tanulmányok* ["The Twilight of the Liberal Anthropology", in *On the Intellectual Life of the Monarchy: Philosophical and Historical Treaties*] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1980).
- Roth, Michael S., "Performing History", *American Historical Review* (June 1994): 729-745.
- Schorske, Carl E., "Introduction", in *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, 1981), xvii-xxx.
- Schorske, Carl E., "Politics and Patricide in Freud's Interpretation of Dreams", in *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, 1981), 181-207.
- Spector, Scott, "Beyond the Aesthetic Garden: Politics and Culture on the Margins of 'Fin-de-siècle Vienna'", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 4 (October 1998): 691-710.
- Sulloway, Frank J., *Freud, Biologist of the Mind: Beyond the Psychoanalytic Legend* (New York: Basic Books, 1979).
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim, *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).
- <http://www.ef.huji.ac.il/publications/Sziklai.pdf>
- 53-72; Erich Fromm, *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis: Essays on Freud, Marx, and Social Psychology* (New York: H. Holt, 1991), 19-22.

Instituto de Desarrollo Psicológico. INDEPSI. LTDA.

ALSF-CHILE